REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-16, 18, 21, 22, 24 and 25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended, and claims 17 and 23 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims and the drawings. Withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 8, 9, 14, 16-18 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,176,688 to Collings (hereinafter "Collings"). Claims 17 and 23 have been cancelled. The rejection, in so far as it applies to claims 1, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 22, 24 and 25, is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a hermetic compressor. Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, a compression part coupled to a motor part, wherein the compression part compresses low temperature, low pressure refrigerant into high temperature, high pressure refrigerant, a discharge muffler positioned adjacent to the compression part, wherein the discharge muffler attenuates noise generated by the refrigerant as it is compressed, and a pseudo-discharge muffler positioned at a side of the compression part which is opposite a side of the compression part at which the discharge muffler is positioned such that a weight of the pseudo-discharge muffler balances a weight of the discharge muffler. Independent claim 1 also recites a discharge pipe that extends through a side of the hermetic container, a loop pipe that extends from the

discharge muffler to the discharge pipe, wherein refrigerant discharged from the discharge muffler flows through the loop pipe and is discharged from the hermetic container through the discharge pipe, wherein the loop pipe includes a plurality of bent portions, and at least one transit tube coupled to an end of the loop pipe, wherein the at least one transit tube surrounds an outer circumferential surface of the end of the loop pipe. Collings neither discloses nor suggests such features, or the claimed combination of features.

Collings discloses a compressor 20 in which fluid is drawn into a housing 22 through a suction tube 56 and directed towards a suction muffler 58. The fluid is directed to a compression mechanism 55, where it is compressed and discharged to a first discharge muffler chamber 70. The fluid is then conveyed into a second discharge muffler chamber 102 through a second conduit 98. Fluid flows out of the second discharge muffler chamber 102 and into a third conduit 130, which extends toward the suction muffler 58 (see Figure 2 of Collings). The third conduit 130 is coupled to an intermediate conduit that loops around a motor 34 and along the opposite side of the suction muffler 58 to a discharge pipe 134 through which compressed fluid is discharged from the housing 22.

The Office Action compares the second discharge muffler chamber 102 to the claimed discharge muffler, and the first discharge muffler chamber 70 to the claimed pseudo-discharge muffler chamber. Independent claim 1 requires that the claimed discharge muffler and pseudo-discharge muffler be positioned on opposite sides of the compression part such that a weight of the pseudo-discharge muffler balances a weight of the discharge muffler. In contrast, Collings

clearly discloses that both the first and second discharge muffler chambers 70 and 102 each performs a significant noise reduction function in the proper operation of the compressor, and that they must necessarily allow fluid to flow therethrough if the fluid is to be properly compressed, noise reduced, and discharged from the compressor. These two discharge muffler chambers 70 and 102 are necessarily always operational mufflers, and the flow of fluid flowing through these two discharge muffler chambers 70 and 102 constantly varies, depending on an operation mode of the compressor. Thus, Collings neither discloses nor suggests that the first discharge muffler chamber 70 is a pseudo-discharge muffler, nor that it can balance a weight of the second discharge muffler chamber 102, as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Collings, and thus the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Collings should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 22, 24 and 25 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 7, 10, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Collings in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,187,996 to Roelsgaard (hereinafter "Roelsgaard"), and rejects claims 4, 5 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Collings in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,835,050 to Na (hereinafter "Na"). The Office Action also rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Collings and Roelsgaard in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,152,703 to Yoshimura

(hereinafter "Yoshimura"), and rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Collings and Roelsgaard in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,478,559 to Andrione (hereinafter "Andrione"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 2, 4-7, 10-12, 15 and 21 are allowable over Collings at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features. Further, Roelsgaard is merely cited as allegedly teaching the use of a synthetic resin, Na is merely cited as allegedly teaching the use of a transit tube, Yoshimura is merely cited as allegedly teaching the use of Teflon, and Andrione is merely cited as allegedly teaching the use of a balance weight at the end of a rotation shaft. Thus, Roelsgaard, Na, Yoshimura and Andrione, either alone or in combination, fail to overcome the deficiencies of Collings. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 4-7, 10-12, 15 and 21 are allowable over the respective applied combinations, and thus the rejections should be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, **Joanna K. Mason**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y. J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Joanna K. Mason
Registration No. 56,408

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 JCE:JKM:lhd
Date: September 26, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610